

RANDOM SCHREIER GRAPHS AND EXPANDERS

LUCA SABATINI

In memory of Carlo Casolo (1958-2020)

ABSTRACT. Let the group G act transitively on the finite set Ω . We show that random Schreier graphs on $O(\log |\Omega|)$ elements are expanders with high probability, magnifying a famous theorem of Alon and Roichman [2]. On the other side, depending on the particular action of G on Ω , we give a lower bound on the number of elements which are *necessary* to provide expansion. We apply this method to estimate the spectral gap in the case where G is nilpotent.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $d \geq 2$, and let Γ be an undirected, d -regular finite graph. For every vector $\mathbf{v} \in \ell^2(\Gamma)$ and every vertex $x \in \Gamma$, the **averaging operator** (or random walk) $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}(\Gamma)$ is defined by

$$\mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}(x) := \frac{1}{d} \sum_{y \sim x} \mathbf{v}(y).$$

It is well known that the (real) spectrum of \mathbf{M} satisfies $\{1 = \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{|\Gamma|} \geq -1\}$. The magnitudes of the gaps $|1 - \lambda_2|$ and $|-1 - \lambda_{|\Gamma|}|$ are linked to relevant properties of Γ , namely its isoperimetric number and pseudorandomness (for a rich introduction on these arguments, we remind to the beautiful survey [6]). In the extremal cases, $\lambda_2 = 1$ if and only if Γ is disconnected, and $\lambda_{|\Gamma|} = -1$ if and only if Γ is bipartite. Thus, it is natural to define

$$\text{gap}(\Gamma) := 1 - \lambda_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda(\Gamma) := \max(|\lambda_2|, |\lambda_{|\Gamma|}|).$$

When $\varepsilon > 0$, we say that Γ is an ε -**expander** if $\text{gap}(\Gamma) \geq \varepsilon$, and a **two-sided** ε -**expander** if $\lambda(\Gamma) \leq 1 - \varepsilon$.

In a famous article, Alon and Roichman [2] proved that, for every finite group G and $\varepsilon > 0$, a random **Cayley graph** on $O_\varepsilon(\log |G|)$ elements is an ε -expander with high probability. Here we deal with what is perhaps the most natural generalization of Cayley graphs, the **Schreier graphs**, which are defined as follows. When a (not necessarily finite) group acts on a finite set Ω , and $S \subseteq G$ is a finite *symmetric multiset*¹, $Sch(G \circlearrowleft \Omega, S)$ is a $|S|$ -regular graph, which has the elements of Ω as vertices, and the edges are the couples (ω, ω^s) , for all $\omega \in \Omega$ and $s \in S$. To lighten the notation, we immediately write

$$\lambda(G \circlearrowleft \Omega, S) := \lambda(Sch(G \circlearrowleft \Omega, S)) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{gap}(G \circlearrowleft \Omega, S) := \text{gap}(Sch(G \circlearrowleft \Omega, S)).$$

A remarkable example is $G = \text{Sym}(n)$ in its natural action on $\{1, \dots, n\}$: when a random multiset $S \subseteq G$ of size $d \geq 1$ is chosen, $Sch(\text{Sym}(n), \{1, \dots, n\}, S \cup S^{-1})$ is a “good” model for a random $2d$ -regular graph [9]. In contrast, here we deal with a generic *transitive* action of a generic group G . In this case, the Schreier graph is a quotient of the corresponding Cayley graph, and it is not hard to see that the already mentioned result from [2] implies that $O_\varepsilon(\log |G|)$ elements are always sufficient to gain $\lambda(G \circlearrowleft \Omega, S) \leq 1 - \varepsilon$. Indeed, we show that $O_\varepsilon(\log |\Omega|)$ elements are already enough, and in a very strong sense.

Theorem 1.1 (Random Schreier graphs are two-sided expanders). *For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a constant C_ε such that the following holds. For every group G and every transitive action of G on a finite set Ω , one has*

$$\mathbb{E}[\lambda(G \circlearrowleft \Omega, S \cup S^{-1})] \leq \varepsilon,$$

where $S \subseteq G$ is a random multiset of $C_\varepsilon \log |\Omega|$ elements.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* primary 05C48, 20P05.

Key words and phrases. Expander graphs; Schreier graphs; nilpotent groups.

¹We shall work in the general context of multisets, which is useful in random arguments. A symmetric multiset $S \subseteq G$ is one for which $s \in S$ implies $s^{-1} \in S$. This is done to make undirected the graphs we deal with.

With the turn of the millennium, other mathematicians found different proofs of Alon-Roichman result, namely Landau and Russell [7], and Christofides and Markström [4], which proved an analogous of Theorem 1.1 for vertex-transitive graphs. These proofs are based on Chernoff-type bounds on operator valued random variables [1]. In Section 3 we show how these can be used to prove Theorem 1.1: this level of generality also highlights one of the main differences between the original technique of [2], the trace method, and the subsequent approach. We also provide the following more explicit statement.

Proposition 1.2. *Let G act transitively on the finite set Ω , and $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$. Then, for a random multiset $S \subseteq G$ of size $O(\varepsilon^{-2} \log(|\Omega|/\delta))$, one has*

$$\text{Prob}(\lambda(G \circlearrowleft \Omega, S \cup S^{-1}) \geq \varepsilon) \leq \delta.$$

On the opposite shore, it would be quite interesting to understand how many elements are really *needed* for expansion. The following parameter measures the abelian sections between the stabilizer of a point and the full acting group.

Definition 1.3. *Let G act transitively on Ω , and fix $\omega \in \Omega$. The **abelian ratio** $\Theta(G \circlearrowleft \Omega)$ is defined as*

$$\Theta(G \circlearrowleft \Omega) := \max_{\text{Stab}(\omega) \leq H \leq G} |H/H' \text{Stab}(\omega)|^{1/|G:H|}.$$

It is easy to check that, effectively, the value of Θ does not depend on the particular ω . Moreover, $1 \leq \Theta(G \circlearrowleft \Omega) \leq |\Omega|$. The interest in Θ comes from the following theorem, which is proved in Section 4.

Theorem 1.4 (Lower bound for expanding sets). *Let G act transitively on Ω , and let $S \subseteq G$ be a symmetric multiset. Then*

$$|S| \geq \frac{4 \log \Theta(G \circlearrowleft \Omega)}{\log(3/\text{gap}(G \circlearrowleft \Omega, S))}.$$

Therefore, the number of elements which are necessary to gain $\text{gap}(G \circlearrowleft \Omega, S) \geq \varepsilon$ lies always between $O_\varepsilon(\log \Theta(G \circlearrowleft \Omega))$ and $O_\varepsilon(\log |\Omega|)$. As an application of this fact, we show that the $O_\varepsilon(\log |\Omega|)$ bound is sharp for nilpotent groups of bounded nilpotency class (equivalently, the spectral gap decays polynomially in the size of the graph). This fairly generalizes the well known fact that the $O_\varepsilon(\log |\Omega|)$ bound is sharp for abelian Cayley graphs (see Theorem 2.8 in the next section, for example).

Proposition 1.5 (Spectral gap of nilpotent Schreier graphs). *Let G be a nilpotent group with nilpotency class at most $k \geq 1$, and let G act transitively on the finite set Ω . If $S \subseteq G$ is any finite symmetric multiset, then*

$$\text{gap}(G \circlearrowleft \Omega, S) \leq 3 \cdot |\Omega|^{-f(|S|, k)},$$

where $f(|S|, k) := \frac{4(|S|-1)}{|S|(|S|^{k+1} - |S|^2 + |S| - 1)}$.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We start describing the spectrum of a Schreier graph, as it is done implicitly in Proposition 11.17 of [6]. To give a more precise description, when $Y \leq G$, we denote by $\text{Irr}(G, Y)$ the set of the irreducible **representations** (up to equivalence) of G which are contained in the permutation representation of G on the cosets of Y . When $Y = 1_G$, $\text{Irr}(G, Y)$ is the full set of the irreducible representations (up to equivalence).

Proposition 2.1 (Spectrum of a Schreier graph). *Let G act transitively on Ω , and let $Y \leq G$ be the stabilizer of a point. Then, **as sets**,*

$$\text{Spec}(\text{Sch}(G \circlearrowleft \Omega, S)) = \bigcup_{\pi \in \text{Irr}(G, Y)} \text{Spec}(\mathbf{M}_\pi),$$

where, for each representation π , the matrix \mathbf{M}_π is defined as

$$\mathbf{M}_\pi := \frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{s \in S} \pi(s).$$

Proof. Let us write $\rho := (1_Y)^\uparrow^G$, i.e. ρ is the permutation representation of G on the right-cosets of Y . The crucial observation is that the averaging operator \mathbf{M} of $\text{Sch}(G \circlearrowleft \Omega, S)$ satisfies

$$\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}_\rho = \frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{s \in S} \rho(s).$$

Now, by a standard result in representation theory, ρ splits in irreducible representations of G , say π_1, \dots, π_k . By definition, these are precisely the irreducible representations in $\text{Irr}(G, Y)$. Thus \mathbf{M} is equivalent to the block-type matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{M}_{\pi_1} & & & & \\ & \mathbf{M}_{\pi_2} & & & \\ & & \ddots & & \\ & & & \mathbf{M}_{\pi_3} & \\ & & & & \ddots \end{pmatrix},$$

and the proof follows. \square

The next lemmas enumerate some facts about Schreier graphs. As it is clear, a transitive action of G is determined by the stabilizer of a point, i.e. by a subgroup of finite index. We reserve the capital letter Y for this subgroup. Given a multiset $S \subseteq G$, following this notation we write

$$\text{Sch}(G, Y, S) := \text{Sch}(G \circlearrowleft \Omega, S).$$

The quantities $\lambda(G, Y, S)$ and $\text{gap}(G, Y, S)$ are defined consequently.

Lemma 2.2 (Reduction to faithful actions). *Let $N \trianglelefteq Y$ be a **normal** subgroup of G . Then*

$$\text{Sch}(G, Y, S) \cong \text{Sch}(G/N, Y/N, \rho(S)),$$

when $\rho : G \rightarrow G/N$ is the natural projection, and $\rho(S)$ is considered again as a multiset. In particular, if $Y \triangleleft G$, one has

$$\text{Sch}(G, Y, S) \cong \text{Sch}(G/Y, 1, \rho(S)) \cong \text{Cay}(G/Y, \rho(S)).$$

Proof. We construct a natural graph isomorphism $\varphi : \text{Sch}(G, Y, S) \rightarrow \text{Sch}(G/N, Y/N, \rho(S))$, which sends the coset Yx in the same coset Yx , but as seen in the quotient G/N . This map is clearly surjective, and it is injective for a reason of cardinality. Moreover, for every $x \in G$ and $s \in S$,

$$\varphi(Yxs) = \varphi(Yx)\rho(s),$$

and so adjacency of vertices is preserved in both directions. \square

Lemma 2.3. *The following hold:*

- (i) for every $x \in G$ one has $\text{Sch}(G, Y, S) \cong \text{Sch}(G, Y^x, S)$;
- (ii) $\text{Sch}(G \circlearrowleft \Omega, S)$ is connected if and only if $\langle S \rangle$ acts transitively on Ω , or equivalently, if and only if $Y\langle S \rangle = G$;
- (iii) if $G = Y\langle S \rangle$, then $\text{Sch}(G, Y, S) \cong \text{Sch}(\langle S \rangle, \langle S \rangle \cap Y, S)$;
- (iv) if $Y \trianglelefteq M \trianglelefteq G$, then $\text{Spec}(\text{Sch}(G, M, S)) \subseteq \text{Spec}(\text{Sch}(G, Y, S))$.

Proof. Since $\text{Stab}(\omega^x) = (\text{Stab}(\omega))^x$, then (i) follows.

The point (ii) follows from the fact that Y lies in the same connected component of the elements of the type $Ys_1 \cdot \dots \cdot s_n$, for $s_1, \dots, s_n \in S$.

For (iii) we have

$$\text{Sch}(G, Y, S) \cong \text{Sch}(G \circlearrowleft (G/Y), S) \cong \text{Sch}(\langle S \rangle \circlearrowleft (G/Y), S).$$

Since it is connected, we can use the notation with the stabilizer for the last Schreier graph. Choosing Y itself as point in G/Y , we get $\langle S \rangle \cap Y$ as stabilizer, and finally

$$\text{Sch}(\langle S \rangle \circlearrowleft (G/Y), S) \cong \text{Sch}(\langle S \rangle, \langle S \rangle \cap Y, S)$$

as desired.

(iv) Since the representation 1_M is contained in $(1_Y)^{\uparrow M}$, we have that $(1_M)^{\uparrow G}$ is contained in $((1_Y)^{\uparrow M})^{\uparrow G} = (1_Y)^{\uparrow G}$. Thus, the proof follows from Proposition 2.1. \square

Lemma 2.4 (Bipartite Criterion for Schreier graphs). *A connected Schreier graph $\text{Sch}(G, Y, S)$ is bipartite if and only if S is disjoint from some (normal) subgroup of index 2 which contains Y .*

Proof. Let $\text{Sch}(G, Y, S)$ be connected and bipartite, and consider $N := \langle Y, S^2 \rangle$. If $x \in S \cap N$, we would have a loop $Y \rightarrow Yx \rightarrow Y$ of odd length in $\text{Sch}(G, Y, S)$. It follows that $S \cap N = \emptyset$, and that N is not the full group G . Moreover, every element of G is a product of the type $y \cdot s_1 \cdot s_2 \cdot \dots$, and so $G = N \sqcup Ns$ for some (in fact every) $s \in S$. It follows that N has index 2 in G .

Now let $N \triangleleft G$ be of index 2, and $S \cap N = \emptyset$. Choose $s \in S$, and notice that $N \cap Ns = \emptyset$ and $N \sqcup Ns = G$ (otherwise

we should have $s \in N$). Finally $Ns \cap NsS = sN \cap sNS = s(N \cap NS) = \emptyset$, and then $N \sqcup Ns$ is a bipartition of $Sch(G, Y, S)$. \square

As we said the introduction, an essential tool for [7] and [4] is really contained in [1], relying in particular in Theorem 19 of that paper.² Here we state that result in the special case $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}] = 1/2$, which is the one required for us. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, all the logarithms are in base 2. Coherently, $\exp(x) := 2^x$.

Lemma 2.5 (Theorem 19 in [1]). *Let V be a Hilbert space of finite dimension and let $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_d$ be i.i.d. hermitian random operators with eigenvalues in $[0, 1]$. Moreover, suppose $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_i] = 1/2$ for all $i = 1, \dots, d$. Then*

$$\text{Prob} \left(\text{Spec} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{X}_i \right) \not\subseteq \left[\frac{d}{2}(1 - \varepsilon), \frac{d}{2}(1 + \varepsilon) \right] \right) \leq 2d \cdot \exp \left(-kH \left(\frac{1 - \varepsilon}{2} \right) \right),$$

where $H(x) := x \log(2x) + (1 - x) \log(2 - 2x)$.

Now we give some preliminaries for the proofs in Section 4. We will use the Rademeister-Schreier method, which we are going to describe. Let $S \subseteq G$, $H \leq G$ and let $T \subseteq G$ be a right transversal of H . Given $x \in G$, denote by \bar{x} the unique element in $T \cap Hx$, and define

$$\bar{S} := \{ts(\bar{ts})^{-1} : t \in T, s \in S\}.$$

Observe that $\bar{S} \subseteq H$ and that $|\bar{S}| = |G : H||S|$, if we look at \bar{S} again as a multiset. We remark the following fact.

Lemma 2.6. *If S is symmetric, then \bar{S} is symmetric.*

Proof. Let $ts(\bar{ts})^{-1} \in \bar{S}$ for some $t \in T$ and $s \in S$. We have

$$(ts(\bar{ts})^{-1})^{-1} = (\bar{ts})s^{-1}t^{-1}.$$

Since this lies in H , it follows that $\overline{(\bar{ts})s^{-1}t^{-1}} = t$. Finally we have that the element

$$(\bar{ts})s^{-1}t^{-1} = (\bar{ts})s^{-1}(\overline{(\bar{ts})s^{-1}})^{-1}$$

lies in \bar{S} , because $\bar{ts} \in T$ and $s^{-1} \in S$. \square

The next lemma is well known: we give a proof for the convenience of the reader.

Lemma 2.7 (Rayleigh-Ritz). *Let \mathbf{M} be a hermitian matrix and \mathbf{v} a vector. Let $\mathbf{v} = c_1\mathbf{v}_1 + \dots + c_j\mathbf{v}_j$ be a decomposition of \mathbf{v} in eigenvectors, and $\lambda_{\min}, \lambda_{\max}$ respectively the minimum and the maximum of the eigenvalues associated to $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_j$. Then*

$$\frac{\langle \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} \rangle} \in [\lambda_{\min}, \lambda_{\max}].$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can suppose that $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_j$ are unitary vectors. Let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_j$ be the eigenvalues associated to $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_j$. We have $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} \rangle = |c_1|^2 + \dots + |c_j|^2$, and

$$\langle \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} \rangle = \langle c_1\lambda_1\mathbf{v}_1, c_1\mathbf{v}_1 \rangle + \dots + \langle c_j\lambda_j\mathbf{v}_j, c_j\mathbf{v}_j \rangle = |c_1|^2\lambda_1 + \dots + |c_j|^2\lambda_j.$$

So $\langle \mathbf{M}\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} \rangle / \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ is a weighted average of the eigenvalues appeared, and then it lies in the interval $[\lambda_{\min}, \lambda_{\max}]$. \square

Finally, we shall invoke the following tight estimate, of which Proposition 1.5 is a sharp generalization (notice that $f(|S|, 1) = 4/|S|$).

Theorem 2.8 (Corollary 3 in [5]). *Let G be a finite **abelian** group and $S \subseteq G$ a symmetric multiset. Then*

$$\text{gap}(G, S) \leq 3 \cdot |G|^{-4/|S|}.$$

²This is really first proved in [1], but the authors modestly attribute the result to Chernoff.

3. RANDOM SCHREIER GRAPHS

In this section we prove Proposition 1.2, and then Theorem 1.1. Before that, we derive another inequality from Lemma 2.5, which is centered in zero, and avoids the function $H(x)$. Given a symmetric matrix \mathbf{A} , we denote by $\lambda(\mathbf{A})$ the largest (in absolute value) eigenvalue of \mathbf{A} .

Lemma 3.1. *Let V be a Hilbert space of finite dimension and let $\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_d$ be i.i.d. hermitian random operators with eigenvalues in $[-1, 1]$. Moreover, suppose $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}_i] = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, d$. Then*

$$\text{Prob} \left(\lambda \left(\frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{A}_i \right) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) \leq 2 \dim(V) \cdot \exp \left(-\frac{d\varepsilon^2}{\ln 4} \right).$$

Proof. Via one distension and one translation, and Lemma 2.5, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob} \left(\lambda \left(\frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{A}_i \right) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) &= \text{Prob} \left(\lambda \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{A}_i \right) \geq \frac{d\varepsilon}{2} \right) = \\ \text{Prob} \left(\text{Spec} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \left(\mathbf{A}_i + \frac{\mathbf{1}}{2} \right) \right) \not\subseteq \left[\frac{d}{2}(1-\varepsilon), \frac{d}{2}(1+\varepsilon) \right] \right) &\leq 2 \dim(V) \cdot \exp \left(-dH \left(\frac{1-\varepsilon}{2} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

It rests to prove that $H \left(\frac{1-\varepsilon}{2} \right) \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\ln 4}$ is true for every $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1$. Let us remark that

$$H \left(\frac{1-\varepsilon}{2} \right) = \left(\frac{1-\varepsilon}{2} \right) \log(1-\varepsilon) + \left(\frac{1+\varepsilon}{2} \right) \log(1+\varepsilon)$$

is a non-increasing function in $[0, 1)$, vanishes in zero and grows up to 1. Changing the base of the logarithms to the natural base, we write

$$H \left(\frac{1-\varepsilon}{2} \right) = \frac{(1-\varepsilon) \ln(1-\varepsilon) + (1+\varepsilon) \ln(1+\varepsilon)}{\ln 4}.$$

Now we need two more inequalities. The first is $\ln(1+\varepsilon) \geq \varepsilon/2$. This can be seen analyzing the function $f(x) := \ln(1+x) - x/2$: it is zero in $x = 0$ and it is increasing in the interval $(0, 1)$. The second inequality similarly follows from the slightly more involved analysis of $f(x) := (1-x) \ln(1-x) + x - \frac{x^2}{2}$. We have $f(0) = 0$ and, since the derivative is $-x - \ln(1-x) > 0$, it can be checked that $f(x)$ is increasing in $(0, 1)$. It follows that $(1-\varepsilon) \ln(1-\varepsilon) \geq -\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}$ for every $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1$. Putting all together, we obtain

$$(1-\varepsilon) \ln(1-\varepsilon) + (1+\varepsilon) \ln(1+\varepsilon) \geq -\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(1+\varepsilon) \geq \varepsilon^2. \quad \square$$

Proof of Proposition 1.2. Let $\varepsilon > 0$, $S \subseteq G$ a random multiset of size $d \geq 1$, and $Y \leq G$ the stabilizer of a point. From Proposition 2.1 and standard probability theory, we have

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Prob}(\lambda(G \circlearrowleft \Omega, S \cup S^{-1}) \geq \varepsilon) &= \text{Prob}(\lambda(G, Y, S \cup S^{-1}) \geq \varepsilon) = \\ \text{Prob} \left(\left(\max_{1 \neq \pi \in \text{Irr}(G, Y)} \lambda(\mathbf{M}_\pi) \right) \geq \varepsilon \right) &\leq \sum_{1 \neq \pi \in \text{Irr}(G, Y)} \text{Prob}(\lambda(\mathbf{M}_\pi) \geq \varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Now fix a non-trivial $\pi \in \text{Irr}(G, Y)$, and look closer at the random, symmetric matrix \mathbf{M}_π . Let s_1, \dots, s_d be the random elements in the group G . We have

$$\mathbf{M}_\pi = \frac{1}{2d} \sum_{i=1}^d \pi(s_i) + \pi(s_i^{-1}) = \frac{1}{d} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\pi(s_i) + \pi(s_i^{-1})}{2} \right).$$

We notice that the hypothesis of Lemma 3.1 are satisfied by the random variables

$$\mathbf{A}_i := \frac{1}{2}(\pi(s_i) + \pi(s_i^{-1})).$$

In fact, for every i ,

- the eigenvalues of $2\mathbf{A}_i$ lie in $[-2, 2]$;
- we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}_i] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in G} \pi_i(x) + \pi_i(x^{-1}) = \sum_{x \in G} \pi_i(x) = 0.$$

With a substitution $\varepsilon \rightarrow \varepsilon/2$, via Lemma 3.1 itself,

$$\text{Prob}(\lambda(\mathbf{M}_\pi) \geq \varepsilon) \leq 2 \dim(\pi) \cdot 2^{-\frac{2d\varepsilon^2}{\ln 2}}.$$

Thus, the proof continues from (3.1), to obtain

$$\sum_{1 \neq \pi \in \text{Irr}(G, Y)} \text{Prob}(\lambda(\mathbf{M}_\pi) \geq \varepsilon) \leq 2 \cdot 2^{-\frac{2d\varepsilon^2}{\ln 2}} \cdot \left(\sum_{1 \neq \pi \in \text{Irr}(G, Y)} \dim(\pi) \right).$$

But the last sum is at most the dimension of the permutation representation on the cosets of Y , which is exactly $|\Omega|$. It follows that

$$\text{Prob}(\lambda(G \circlearrowleft \Omega, S \cup S^{-1}) \geq \varepsilon) \leq 2|\Omega| \cdot 2^{-\frac{2d\varepsilon^2}{\ln 2}}.$$

Fix $\delta > 0$, and set

$$d = \left\lceil \frac{\ln 2}{2\varepsilon^2} \cdot \log \left(\frac{2|\Omega|}{\delta} \right) \right\rceil.$$

When put in the previous inequality, this provides

$$\text{Prob}(\lambda(G \circlearrowleft \Omega, S \cup S^{-1}) \geq \varepsilon) \leq \delta. \quad \square$$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $\lambda := \lambda(G \circlearrowleft \Omega, S \cup S^{-1})$, and fix $\varepsilon' > 0$. Set $\varepsilon = \delta = \frac{\varepsilon'}{2}$ in Proposition 1.2. Since λ takes value in $[0, 1]$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\lambda] \leq 1 \cdot \text{Prob}(\lambda \geq \varepsilon) + \varepsilon \cdot \text{Prob}(\lambda < \varepsilon) \leq \delta + \varepsilon = \varepsilon'$$

as desired. □

We stress that, in the statements of Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 1.2, there is no substantial difference with the setting where repetitions are not allowed: in fact, $O(\log |\Omega|)$ randomly chosen elements in Ω are almost surely made of distinct members.

4. SPECTRAL GAP AND ABELIAN SECTIONS

Given a finite group G , the study of the algebraic conditions of G which are necessary (or sufficient) for the existence of a Cayley graph on G with good expanding properties has a long history, which goes back to [8]. In that article, the authors notice that a large abelian section close to the top is a bad feature while looking for a large spectral gap. However, their work do not involve the spectral gap directly (but the so-called *Kazhdan constant*), and, as we said, only concerns the Cayley graph case. With this in mind, it is easy to see that our Theorem 1.4 is equivalent to the following.

Proposition 4.1 (Improved Lubotzky-Weiss inequality). *Let G act transitively on Ω , and $S \subseteq G$ a symmetric multiset. Fix $\omega \in \Omega$. Then, for every intermediate subgroup $\text{Stab}(\omega) \leq H \leq G$, one has*

$$\text{gap}(G \circlearrowleft \Omega, S) \leq 3 \cdot |H/H' \text{Stab}(\omega)|^{-4/|S||G:H|}.$$

The main new ingredient, which is required for the proof of Proposition 4.1, is the following lemma. It is a generalized and improved version of Proposition 3.9 in [8], and recalls the standard fact that \overline{S} generates H if S generates G .

Lemma 4.2. *For every $Y \leq H \leq G$ and $S \subseteq G$ one has*

$$\text{gap}(H, Y, \overline{S}) \geq \text{gap}(G, Y, S),$$

where $\overline{S} \subseteq H$ (a set obtained via the Rademeister-Schreier method) is considered as a multiset. Moreover

$$\lambda(H, Y, \overline{S}) \leq \lambda(G, Y, S).$$

Proof. First, $\text{Sch}(H, Y, \overline{S})$ is an undirected graph because of Lemma 2.6. Let $T \subseteq G$ be the transversal of H which is used to provide \overline{S} , and let $R \subseteq H$ be any transversal of Y in H . Moreover, let \mathbf{M}_H be the averaging operator of $\text{Sch}(H, Y, \overline{S})$, and let $\mathbf{M}_H \mathbf{f} = \tau \mathbf{f}$ for some eigenvalue τ and eigenfunction $\mathbf{f} \in \ell^2(H/Y)$.

If we write $\mathcal{Z}(H/Y)$ to denote the (one-dimensional) subspace of constant functions, then $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{Z}(H/Y)^\perp$, i.e. \mathbf{f} is

a function which sums to zero. Now we extend \mathbf{f} to $\tilde{\mathbf{f}} \in \ell^2(G/Y)$ in the following way: $\tilde{f}(Yrt) = f(Yr)$ for every $r \in R$ and $t \in T$. We notice that $\tilde{\mathbf{f}} \in \mathcal{Z}(G/Y)^\perp$, in fact

$$\langle \tilde{\mathbf{f}}, \mathbf{1} \rangle = \sum_{\substack{r \in R \\ t \in T}} \tilde{f}(Yrt) = \sum_{\substack{r \in R \\ t \in T}} f(Yr) = |G : H| \sum_{r \in R} f(Yr) = |G : H| \langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{1} \rangle = 0.$$

Moreover,

$$\langle \tilde{\mathbf{f}}, \tilde{\mathbf{f}} \rangle = \sum_{\substack{r \in R \\ t \in T}} \tilde{f}(Yrt)^2 = \sum_{t \in T} \langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{f} \rangle = |G : H| \langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{f} \rangle$$

and

$$\langle \mathbf{M}\tilde{\mathbf{f}}, \tilde{\mathbf{f}} \rangle = \frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{\substack{r \in R \\ t \in T}} \sum_{s \in S} \tilde{f}(Yrts) \tilde{f}(Yrt) = \frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{\substack{r \in R \\ t \in T}} \sum_{s \in S} \tilde{f}(Yrts) f(Yr).$$

Write $rts = rts(\overline{ts})^{-1}\overline{ts}$, so that $\tilde{f}(Yrts) = f(Yrts(\overline{ts})^{-1})$. It follows that

$$\langle \mathbf{M}\tilde{\mathbf{f}}, \tilde{\mathbf{f}} \rangle = \frac{|G : H|}{|S|} \sum_{r \in R} \sum_{s \in \overline{S}} f(Yrs) f(Yr) = |G : H| \langle \mathbf{M}_H \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{f} \rangle.$$

Finally, we can write

$$\tau = \frac{\tau \langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{f} \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{f} \rangle} = \frac{\langle \tau \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{f} \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{f} \rangle} = \frac{\langle \mathbf{M}_H \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{f} \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{f} \rangle} = \frac{\langle \mathbf{M}\tilde{\mathbf{f}}, \tilde{\mathbf{f}} \rangle}{\langle \tilde{\mathbf{f}}, \tilde{\mathbf{f}} \rangle}.$$

Using the Rayleigh-Ritz Lemma 2.7, we see that the last ratio lies in $[-1, 1 - \text{gap}(G, Y, S)]$. Similarly, it lies in $[-\lambda(G, Y, S), \lambda(G, Y, S)]$. \square

Remark 4.3. When looking at \overline{S} as a set (i.e. without multiplicity), the inequality $\text{gap}(H, Y, \overline{S}) \geq \text{gap}(G, Y, S)$ is not true. In fact, with the help of a computer we found a counterexample with a group of order 24.

Remark 4.4. Let $Y \leq H \leq G$, and $S \subseteq G$. Let $\overline{S} \subseteq H$ be obtained via the Rademeister-Schreier method. When combined with Lemma 2.4, the second part of Lemma 4.2 implies that if \overline{S} avoids some subgroup of H of index 2, then S avoids some subgroup of G of index 2 which contains Y . In particular, if G has not subgroups of index 2, then **all** the Schreier graphs of the type $\text{Sch}(H, Y, \overline{S})$ are not bipartite.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Since $H' \triangleleft H$, it follows that $H'Y$ is a subgroup of H which contains Y . Looking at \overline{S} as a multiset, from Lemmas 4.2 and 2.3 (iv) we have

$$\text{gap}(G, Y, S) \leq \text{gap}(H, Y, \overline{S}) \leq \text{gap}(H, H'Y, \overline{S}).$$

Since $H'Y$ is normal in H , from Lemma 2.2 we have $\text{Sch}(H, H'Y, \overline{S}) \cong \text{Cay}(H/H'Y, \rho(\overline{S}))$, where we look at $\rho(\overline{S})$ again as a multiset. Then we can apply Theorem 2.8 to this last (abelian) Cayley graph, to obtain

$$\text{gap}(G, Y, S) \leq \text{gap}(H/H'Y, \rho(\overline{S})) \leq 3 \cdot |H/H'Y|^{-4/|\rho(\overline{S})|}.$$

The fact that $|\rho(\overline{S})| = |\overline{S}| = |G : H||S|$ concludes the proof. \square

To reach Proposition 1.5, we show that the abelian quotient $G/G' \text{Stab}(\omega)$ is comparable in size to $|\Omega|$. This is done in the following lemma, which may be of independent interest. For every $i \geq 1$, we denote by $\gamma_i(G)$ the i -th term of the lower central series of $G = \gamma_1(G)$.

Lemma 4.5. Let G be a group, and $Y \leq G$ a subgroup of finite index such that $\langle Y, S \rangle = G$ for some set $S \subseteq G$ of size at most $d \geq 1$. Moreover, suppose that $\gamma_{k+1}(G) \subseteq Y$ for some $k \geq 1$. Then

$$|G/G'Y| \geq |G : Y|^{c(d,k)},$$

where $c(d, k) := \frac{d-1}{d^{k+1} - d^2 + d - 1}$.

Proof. First, for every $i \geq 0$, we notice that

$$\gamma_{i+1}(G)Y \triangleleft \gamma_i(G)Y,$$

because $\gamma_i(G)Y = \gamma_i(G)(\gamma_{i+1}(G)Y)$ and $\gamma_i(G)$ is central modulo $\gamma_{i+1}(G)$. This also shows that the quotients $\gamma_i(G)Y/\gamma_{i+1}(G)Y$ are all abelian. Now we can write

$$Y = \gamma_{k+1}(G)Y \triangleleft \gamma_k(G)Y \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft \gamma_3(G)Y \triangleleft G'Y \triangleleft G.$$

Observe that, for every i , the commutator mapping defines a surjective bilinear form

$$\frac{\gamma_i(G)Y}{\gamma_{i+1}(G)Y} \times \frac{G}{G'Y} \twoheadrightarrow \frac{\gamma_{i+1}(G)Y}{\gamma_{i+2}(G)Y},$$

by setting $(x\gamma_{i+1}(G)Y, zG'Y) \rightarrow [x, z]\gamma_{i+2}(G)Y$ for every $x \in \gamma_i(G)$ and $z \in G$. To check that this is well defined, let $\gamma_1 \in \gamma_{i+1}(G)$, $\gamma_2 \in G'$, $y_1, y_2 \in Y$. Working in the quotient over $\gamma_{i+2}(G)Y$, and noting that γ_1 is central in this quotient, we have

$$[x\gamma_1y_1, z\gamma_2y_2] = [x, z\gamma_2] = [x, \gamma_2][x, z]^{\gamma_2} = [x, z].$$

From the universal property of tensor products, this map defines a surjective group homomorphism

$$\frac{\gamma_i(G)Y}{\gamma_{i+1}(G)Y} \otimes \frac{G}{G'Y} \twoheadrightarrow \frac{\gamma_{i+1}(G)Y}{\gamma_{i+2}(G)Y}.$$

for every $1 \leq i \leq k-1$. This has two consequences. First, the group on the left side can be generated by

$$d(\gamma_i(G)Y/\gamma_{i+1}(G)Y) \cdot d(G/G'Y)$$

elements, while certainly $d(G/G'Y) \leq d$. It follows that

$$d\left(\frac{\gamma_{i+1}(G)Y}{\gamma_{i+2}(G)Y}\right) \leq d\left(\frac{\gamma_i(G)Y}{\gamma_{i+1}(G)Y}\right) \cdot d,$$

and by induction $d(\gamma_i(G)Y/\gamma_{i+1}(G)Y) \leq d^i$ for every $i \geq 1$. Similarly, the order of an elementary element

$$x \otimes z \in \frac{\gamma_i(G)Y}{\gamma_{i+1}(G)Y} \otimes \frac{G}{G'Y}$$

is at most the least common multiple between the order of $x \in \gamma_i(G)Y/\gamma_{i+1}(G)Y$ and the order of $z \in G/G'Y$. Since $\gamma_i(G)Y/\gamma_{i+1}(G)Y$ is abelian, by induction, the order of every element in $\gamma_i(G)Y/\gamma_{i+1}(G)Y$ is at most $|G/G'Y|$, for every $i \geq 1$. For all $i \geq 2$, this implies that

$$\left| \frac{\gamma_i(G)Y}{\gamma_{i+1}(G)Y} \right| \leq |G/G'Y|^{d^i},$$

while for $i=1$ we leave $|\gamma_1(G)Y/\gamma_2(G)Y| = |G/G'Y|$ in the computation. Finally, we obtain

$$|G : Y| = \prod_{i=1}^k |\gamma_i(G)Y/\gamma_{i+1}(G)Y| \leq |G/G'Y|^{1+d^2+\dots+d^k} = |G/G'Y|^{\frac{d^{k+1}-1}{d-1}-d},$$

which is equivalent to the thesis. \square

Remark 4.6. *The previous result fails dramatically if one replaces the nilpotency class with the derived length. As an example, a dihedral group D_{2^n} is metabelian, but its abelianization has size at most 4.*

Proof of Proposition 1.5. Let $Y \leq G$ be the stabilizer of a point. If $Y\langle S \rangle$ is not the full group G , then there is nothing to prove, because $\text{gap}(G \circ \Omega, S) = 0$. When $G = Y\langle S \rangle$, one can choose the quantity d in Lemma 4.5 as $|S|$ itself. Choosing $H = G$ in the definition of the abelian ratio, we see that $\Theta(G \circ \Omega) \geq |G/G'Y| \geq |\Omega|^{c(d,k)}$. Then, arranging the terms in the statement of Theorem 1.4, we obtain

$$\text{gap}(G \circ \Omega, S) \leq 3 \cdot \Theta(G \circ \Omega)^{-4/|S|} \leq 3 \cdot |\Omega|^{-f(|S|,k)}. \quad \square$$

Remark 4.7. *A similar result can be obtained via a purely combinatorial method. Indeed, a nilpotent group with bounded nilpotency class has “polynomial growth”, as it is explained in [3]. This property is hereditate at once by the Schreier graph, via the quotient by the normal core of Y , and so it is easy to see that this graph has very large diameter. Finally, it is well known that a large diameter implies a large spectral gap (see [6], for example). However, the bound we obtain along this road is weaker than Proposition 1.5 itself, and so it is not worth to state it precisely.*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This article is part of the author’s PhD thesis, which was written under the great supervision of Professors Carlo Casolo and Pablo Spiga, to whom I owe important thanks. This work was partially funded by the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica “Francesco Severi” (INdAM).

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Ahlswede, A. Winter, *Strong converse for identification via quantum channels*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **48** (2002), 569-579.
- [2] N. Alon, Y. Roichman, *Random Cayley graphs and expanders*, Random Structures and Algorithms **5** (2) (1994), 271-284.
- [3] S. Black, *Asymptotic growth of finite groups*, Journal of Algebra **209** (1998), 402-426.
- [4] D. Christofides, K. Markström, *Expansion properties of random Cayley graphs and vertex-transitive graphs via matrix martingales*, Random Structures and Algorithms **32** (1) (2008), 88-100.
- [5] J. Friedman, R. Murty, J-P. Tillich, *Spectral estimates for abelian Cayley graphs*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory **B** (96) (2006), 111-121.
- [6] S. Hoory, N. Linial, A. Wigderson, *Expander graphs and their applications*, Bulletin (New Series) of the American Mathematical Society **43** (4) (2006), 439-561.
- [7] Z. Landau, A. Russell, *Random Cayley graphs are expanders: a simple proof of the Alon-Roichman theorem*, The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics **11** (2004), Research Paper 62.
- [8] A. Lubotzky, B. Weiss, *Groups and expanders*, DIMACS Series in Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science **10** (1993), 95-109.
- [9] D. Puder, *Expansion of random graphs: new proofs, new results*, Inventiones Mathematicae **201** (2015), 845-908.

LUCA SABATINI, DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA E INFORMATICA "ULISSE DINI",
UNIVERSITY OF FIRENZE, VIALE MORGAGNI 67/A, 50134 FIRENZE, ITALY
Email address: `luca.sabatini@unifi.it`